UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Making of Many Books - - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Living Bible - - - - *A. J. Bahm*

Hitlerism in America - *Myles D. Blanchard*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 10

Chicago, January 20, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 147
Jottings—J. H. H. 149

ARTICLES—
The Making of Many Books—VICTOR S. YARROS 150
The Living Bible—A. J. BAHM 154
Hitlerism in America—MYLES D. BLANCHARD 156
On the Pacifist Front—XXX 157

POETRY—
Winter—LUCY GOODE LAW 158

THE STUDY TABLE—
Religion and Religions—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 159
A Philosophy of Religious Education—C. A. HAWLEY 159

CORRESPONDENCE—
"All Clear!"—BETTY HIRSCH 160
Winston Churchill and America—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 160
UNITY Praised and Used—JULIAN B. FEIBELMAN 160
Where We Are Standing—HANS H. BAASCH 160
UNITY and War—MYLES D. BLANCHARD 160

THE FIELD—
A Statement on the War—Issued by the Federal Council of Churches 146

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Statement on the War

Issued by the Federal Council of Churches

In these days when we face a world torn by war, when first one nation and then another is ravaged by military aggression and when millions of people are rendered helpless and homeless, it is imperative that as Christians, so far as possible, we speak with a united and unequivocal voice.

We agree that in the outcome of the present conflict moral issues are at stake which, as Christians, we dare not evade. There are certain political objectives which touch vitally the Christian way of life. One is that government should permit the full freedom of the Christian conscience to bear public witness to the truth as it sees it and to carry on its God-given task of declaring the Christian Gospel to the entire world. Another is the attainment of a world order dedicated to peace and justice and resting upon the consent of mankind. The church cannot be indifferent to conflicts which involve, and the outcome of which may affect, such basic and fundamental objectives.

While agreeing in our understanding of the issues at stake, we differ in our view of the way in which they can best be met. Some, admitting that there may be circumstances in which armed resistance against injustice or aggression becomes a duty, are convinced that in the present crisis the United States can best serve the world by maintaining an attitude of political neutrality. Others believe that a victory of the axis powers would so seriously prejudice the cause both of Christianity and of democracy that they would have this country grant its moral and material support to Great Britain and her Allies to any extent short of armed intervention. Others believe that war is never a Christian way, nor an effective way, of achieving a Christian end and therefore refuse to take any part in war, whatever the cause for which it is waged.

It is not for the church to determine what attitude the individual Christian should take toward these alternatives, but it is the duty of the church to vindicate the right of conscience for all its members. It must support the right of the conscientious Christian to register his objection to war service; it must equally defend the right of the Christian who, though hating war, feels that it is his duty to engage in a war which he regards as just. Both have their place in the church and their right to its ministry.

Although the church cannot decide questions of conscience for the individual, it can help him to a right decision by reminding him of the principles which must determine that decision. Here, too, we find a wide measure of agreement.

We agree that war is not an isolated thing, which can be attacked directly, but an effect of deeper underlying causes. These causes are not

(Continued on page 159)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1941 No. 10

MEN OF FAITH

Liberty, which democracy safeguards, is always in danger. In every generation it is threatened by enslaving forces, economic, political, social. The battle for it is never fully won, but always to be won. That battle is a spiritual battle—in the souls of individuals as well as in society. We cannot make a free nation out of enslaved souls, nor give souls freedom where civil and economic liberties are denied. The victory in this battle, both inward and outward, belongs age after age to men of faith.

—Henry Sloane Coffin

BOMBING AMERICA

It's amazing to note how every now and then remarks are inadvertently dropped which reveal, as by a flash of lightning, the insincerity and danger of much of the war propaganda which is now beating upon this country. A beautiful example has just come along in the case of Major George Fielding Eliot, military expert writing in the New York *Herald-Tribune*. Arguing that Ireland should give naval bases to Britain, and that America should use her influence to persuade Ireland to do this, since it involves our safety as well as Britain's, he writes this passage:

> It is, of course, difficult to reply to the Irishman who says in answer: "Very well, but it is we who shall be bombed, and not you." This is true in part, but it is a fact that the great shipyards and industries of Northern Ireland have not been severely bombed as yet, being well out of reach of German planes, or at least so much so that the Germans prefer to drop their bombs on targets they can reach more effectively.

"Well out of reach of German planes"! Well, for heaven's sake, if this is the case, what have *we* got to fear from German planes? We do not know the distance from England to Ireland, nor precisely the distance across England, nor the exact distance across the Channel (23 miles wide) from the nearest German flying base. But all these distances added together can amount only to a few hundred miles—perhaps as many hundreds of miles as there are thousands across the ocean to our shores. Yet Major Eliot feels that Irishmen are wrong in worrying about German bombs, since obviously Ireland is "well out of reach of German planes, or at least so much so" that bombardment does not present a decisive menace. Is it not time, therefore, that we got over our fears? British propaganda is now wildly loose upon us, with every imaginable device being used to persuade us that England may collapse in ninety days, and America thereupon be in immediate danger of attack. But if we are sensible at all, we ought to know that, whatever England's danger, our insecurity is pure fantasy. Within a month we heard three speakers, honored with a place on the program of the Town Meeting of the Air, say on that platform and over the radio, in so many words, that a German invasion of this continent is as preposterous as a Martian invasion of the earth. These speakers were H. G. Wells, Mrs. Anne Hare McCormick, and Boake Carter. If *they* can say it, *we* can say it with the ample authority of such names.

HURRAH FOR PROSPERITY!

It was amusing, also tragic, to read the New Year financial supplements of the newspapers and see how everything is suddenly booming in this country. Already we have passed the fantastic peak of production and income in 1929, and there seems to be no limit to where we may go in the months ahead. For a war is loose on this planet, and we have made ourselves "the arsenal" for one of the two combatants in the fight, and that means prosperity piled on prosperity. But it's a strange sort of person that can find any satisfaction in this phenomenon. At bottom is the essential unhealthiness of solving problems of economic depression and disaster by methods of war and preparedness for war. That's what Hitler did—end unemployment by putting everybody to work in ammunition and arms factories. Now America is doing the same thing—and we count it as bad here as there. This is one reason, let it be noted, why it is so difficult to stop a war once it is well started. Think of what an economic crash there would be in Germany if Hitler suddenly made peace! It would be a case of the 1922-23 collapse all over again. What wonder that the Fuehrer keeps going! And the same thing applies to England and to this country. Once get this arsenal of ours working at full blast for the Empire, and every influence will be bent toward pushing off the return of peace until the last possible moment. Thus does the vicious circle catch us—war makes for good business, and good business makes for war. Then there is the moral side of this question. What indictment of our whole capitalist system is so damning as this fact that fighting and killing make for

prosperity? Are we never going to do business in terms of fostering the lives rather than compassing the deaths of men and women? If anything makes us cringe it is the thought that nothing is so easy and natural in our society as coining money out of blood. The prospects ahead, as the newspaper supplements remind us, are bright. That is, over the short view—six months, a year, two years! But what about the long view? What will happen when this war ends, as it must end some day? Of course, if the war goes on for years, complete destruction and bankruptcy will lead to revolution. If the war ends abruptly, there will be a shock which will shake our whole system to its foundations. In neither case is the outlook bright. Which may be the reason why most men seem to be content to live in the fool's paradise of this present hour! Wall Street is happy, so why should we not all be?

KEEP COOL—BE FAIR!

To keep our heads, to be fair to friend and foe alike, to seek truth and accept it when it appears, to trust in man and have abiding faith in God—this is the supreme challenge of this hour, prompted by some things we read in a single copy of the New York *Times* the other morning. There is no question about the *Times'* orthodoxy on this war problem, no question as to its whole-hearted pro-English and anti-Nazi attitude, and no question as to the authentic nature of the news which is admitted to its columns. So it means something when, on December 10th last, we read:

1. An article which declared that there is no sabotage wave in this country. Speaking for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington, the Assistant-Director, Mr. E. A. Tamm, warned against hysteria. "There is no wave of sabotage sweeping the country," he said. The statistics of fires and explosions, he continued, have "shown no more increase during the past year than might be attributed to increased business and the increased risks of speed-up and employment of inexperienced men." There are fifth-column influences at work in industry, but these are known and watched by the F. B. I.

2. An article cabled from London (and therefore passed by the English government censor) which stated that the treatment of British prisoners of war in occupied Belgium and France is "good." The information, as supplied by two Swiss physicians, is to the effect that the prisoners "are being well cared for and their feeding is good." An excerpt from an official report, "approved by British officials," reads:

> The treatment is excellent and the food is good, identical with that given wounded Germans at the same hospital. Among the several institutions served by captured British doctors are hospitals at Malines and Ghent.
>
> The men like to live in labor detachments, where they are well treated and receive pay.

3. An editorial which analyzed the Hoover Plan for feeding the starving civilians of four occupied European countries, and pointed out the danger of withholding relief:

> There is no telling what distorted thinking may occur in the minds of enslaved peoples this winter as they see themselves and their children faced with hunger and disease. No matter how bravely these peoples fought for freedom before they were overwhelmed, no matter how they loathe the indignities now being heaped upon them by their conquerors, they may yet turn against Great Britain as they see the warships of the British Navy denying them the relief that might otherwise come to them. Will Great Britain's allies-in-exile fight on if they think that their families are starving? Will Great Britain have the full devotion of the Norwegian seamen, of the Free French soldiers, of the Polish and Belgian airmen, of the great army of liberation now being trained on British soil?
>
> It would be a bitter awakening for Great Britain if, after all her sacrifices, she were to win the war and discover that the democratic peoples of the Continent had been alienated.

It is good for the morale of the species to read these articles. Things are not wholly as bad as they might be. Yet there are those who think it treason to believe such good reports. Well, in this case, let such persons blame the *Times*.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION AGAIN

We thought we had settled it—this liquor question!—when we got rid of Prohibition. But it doesn't seem to be so. Look at what's been happening! (1) The bootlegger is with us again. This was the baleful figure raised up by the 18th Amendment, so we were told, and certain to be abolished if this Amendment were abolished. But he has been with us right along. The largest illicit still ever unearthed by the secret service agents was discovered only a few months ago! And now the bootlegger is on the front page again. Taking advantage of the scarcity of French products in the "booze" field, he is flooding the market with bogus champagnes and cognacs and cordials, all sold at an enormous price. "The stage obviously is set," says the New York *Herald-Tribune,* "for a return to the conditions which prevailed during Prohibition." As though these conditions had not always prevailed, as witness the history of the word "bootlegger" itself! (2) The menace of drunken driving is getting worse and worse—and drunken pedestrianism, too! The rise of intoxicants as a factor in traffic accidents has become so alarming that the problem is the subject of a special report published by the *Quarterly Journal of Studies in Alcohol* issued by Yale University. The author of this report, Donald S. Berry, of the National Safety Council, finds that drunken or drinking drivers involved in fatal accidents increased from 7 per cent in 1933 to 11 per cent in 1939, and drinking pedestrians so involved from 8 per cent to 15 per cent. One out of three fatal accidents at night last year involved drinking. Mayor La Guardia, who gloried in flouting the Prohibition law, is now so alarmed by this traffic situation, that he has called upon the police and the courts of New York to have no mercy on the drinking offender. (3) Lastly, there is the statement of Dr. Horatio

M. Pollock, mental hygiene statistician of the New York State Department of Health, that America's liquor bill is more than $5,000,000,000 a year, *"not including the cost of the liquor itself."* His five billion estimate represents simply the cost of the damage done by drinking. Thus, Dr. Pollock declares that there are at least 1,000,000 chronic alcoholics in the country. Many of these are not complete liabilities, but Dr. Pollock estimates that only those arrested for intoxication cost the nation last year $5,113,593,000. To this enormous sum must be added loss of earnings, hospitalization, etc. All this adds up to a tragic situation. At long last, society is going to learn that it can't get along with liquor. But how long—how long?

HENRI BERGSON

Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, Henri Bergson—these are the three immortal names of learning in our time. (All Jews, by the way!) Henri Bergson is now dead in France under circumstances which recall the pitiful passing of Freud in England a year ago. Both men in their great old age saw the destruction under military invasion of their countries and their cultures. Both men lost their homes, their books, their papers—all that extension of personality which is not infrequently more vital than the physical body itself. Both men fell into poverty and degradation, and died in misery. And all this just an item or two in the overwhelming tragedy of our time! Bergson's last days were heroic. An invalid for years, he refused any and all privilege that might attach to his great name, and cast in his lot with the French Jews under Nazi tyranny. His presence in the food line—a sick old man near to death, and one of the immortals of our time—was a thing to break the heart. Inevitably one's mind goes back to the days of Bergson's greatness, when his lectures at the Sorbonne in Paris packed his lecture hall to suffocation with excited throngs, and his book, *Creative Evolution,* ranked him first among living philosophical thinkers. Bergson, like Plato, had a matchless literary style, and wrote with a beauty which captured the attention and interest of many who could not follow his thought. Bergson, like Kant, had a creative mind which fructified the often sterile speculations of the age, and opened up a whole new era of philosophy. The tremendous evolutionary thought of the nineteenth century had come to an end when this genius came along and quickened it anew to life. Bergson's books, *Creative Evolution, Matter and Memory, Time and Free Will,* were gigantic achievements. His latest work, *Morality and Religion,* was disappointing. The 1914-1918 war had broken his mind as it had ended his work. Now he passes like some great figure of an ancient age. We have but to measure the magnitude of such a man, and see his vast achievements swept away in the anarchy of war, to realize how truly and terribly the midnight of barbarism is falling upon our world.

Jottings

In the last issue of UNITY, we published the names of the famous dead of 1940. The list was complete to Christmas Day. In the succeeding week to New Year's, there died: DANIEL FROHMAN, famous American theatrical manager, ERNEST LAWFORD, actor, C. H. ALDRICH, leading architect, and D. W. WYLIE, Presbyterian clergyman.

In our last issue, we invited our readers to guess the one ruler in the world who celebrated Christmas in the spirit of Christianity, and offered a six-month free subscription to the first reader who guessed correctly. The anwer is *Pius XII, Pope of Rome.*

Fashion decrees this winter that shoulders shall be "natural." This is indeed a relief. We had imagined that, so far as styles are concerned, nothing would ever be again as nature made it.

The space allotted to it in the newspapers would seem to indicate that the ban placed upon the big radio chains by the ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers) has been a catastrophe of major proportions. Think of radio listeners being denied all the music of our contemporary jazz orchestras! Nothing to listen to but Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms, Stephen Foster, Gilbert and Sullivan, and Offenbach!

The newspapers are hard reading for most of us these grim and ghastly days. But Zog, King of Albania, and Hailie Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopa, must be revelling in every headline.

To drag Ireland into the war and to keep Spain out of it are now the chief aims of Allied diplomacy, including the American.

J. H. H.

The Making of Many Books

VICTOR S. YARROS

To the making of many books there is no end, says the Bible. Of course, too many books are written and published—books which offer nothing new and lack even the merit of freshness or charm of style. Ruskin was guilty of considerable exaggeration when he said that whenever he read an advertisement of a new book, he bought or read an old one. There is no doubt, however, that with hosts of men and women reading is not a pleasure, but a form of dissipation. They read to kill time, to escape *ennui*. They retain little of what they devour so hastily and inattentively. They skip without having acquired the necessary art of skipping. And they do not stop to reflect, to re-read and discuss striking or profound passages.

Intelligent reading is very rare. Few seem to have discovered the simple truth that one can save much time, energy, and money by neglecting all third-class and second-class books and going for information or knowledge to the first-rate work which the others merely echo and copy. One good book on the Single Tax, for example, or on Marxian Socialism, or on Fabian Socialism, or on Protection *vs.* Free Trade, or on Evolution, or on Relativity, is enough, provided you know which of the many available books is really original, adequate, and in a scientific sense up to date.

Books have been divided into two classes—books of power and books of beauty or delight. The foregoing observations apply to the first class, not to the second. There is no "best" book in poetry, fiction, the drama, literary criticism, the essay. Because you have read Balzac and Dickens, you cannot reasonably dispense with Proust, Henry James, Thomas Mann, Virginia Wolfe. Sophocles and Aeschylus are very modern, in a sense, but we should lose much if we failed to read the plays of Ibsen, Shaw, and Chekhov.

Our debt to books is beyond computation. In a thousand ways, direct or indirect, books educate us, civilize us, give us understanding, deepen and extend our sympathies, enlarge our horizons. One does not argue or debate with books; one does not try to score points; one is not ashamed to give credit to a book or to acknowledge an error revealed to you by a book. Books slowly and subtly modify our opinions; "joint debates" are more apt to generate sophistry and dishonesty.

It is not, however, my intention to develop the foregoing truisms or to pay tribute to books. I propose in this paper to record impressions and gains which remain with me as the result of wide and catholic book reading despite the lapse and ravages of time. We forget much, inevitably, even if we are dowered with excellent memories, but certain lessons and messages we retain, and they help us in hours of need, or enrich and ennoble our lives.

Do not expect any system or method in the random recollections and comments that are to follow. I apply the needle to the disk in our brain, and the association of ideas, accidental timeliness, or what not, bring certain themes and ideas to the light of day. Only some of these can be set down here.

Years ago I read a volume of essays by William Inge, former Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, in which that staunch conservative, that vigorous opponent of paternalism and severe critic of labor unions, declared that only individuals are capable of rising above their personal or economic interests, while classes never have and never can free themselves from the power of selfish interest. How many upheavals and revolutions that candid statement explains! The real author of revolution is the unbending and stubborn Tory, the Bourbon who learns nothing and forgets nothing! We have nothing to fear from the Thomases and the Browders, and much from the bigoted, purblind industrial tyrants and financial jugglers.

A question which has troubled hundreds of generations and still remains a subject of controversy has been settled for me by two men—Spinoza and Cardinal Newman. That question is: To what extent does intellectual education, or mere knowledge, promote goodness and moral progress? If we know what is right, do we do the right thing? Disagreeing with Aristotle, Spinoza in his *Ethics* affirms that ideas are weak, pale, and impotent in the presence of passions and strong desires. An idea is a generalization, an abstract proposition, a conclusion arrived at in the light of history or common experience. We accept it only *if* nothing within us resists and rejects it. Only passion can overcome passion; one strong desire or urge may offset or defeat another. The prevalence of certain venereal diseases in modern society is due less to ignorance than to lack of self-control.

Cardinal Newman, in his lecture on "The Idea of a University," clinched the matter for me. He wrote:

> Knowledge is one thing; virtue is another. Philosophy, however enlightened, however profound, gives no command over passions. . . . Quarry the granite rock with razors or moor the vessel with a thread of silk; then you may hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and pride of man.

In another essay Newman says that "the phenomena which are the basis of morals and religion" are "faint shadows and tracings, certain indeed, but delicate, fragile and almost evanescent, which the mind recognizes at one time, not at another, discerns when it is calm, loses when it is in agitation. The phenomena may be obscured in the human mind by passion, or moral fault, or other causes."

It is interesting to note here that the so-called Austrian or Böhm Bawerk theory of Interest—the theory which has superseded that of the Classical economists—rests on the preference we all have for *present* pleasures over possible *future* satisfactions. To defer any satisfaction, according to that theory, is to make a sacrifice, and sacrifices have to be paid for, even if no more is involved than the postponement of a generous gift to a university, or hospital, or opera house, by a multi-millionaire. A mental picture, an idea, a mere promise to one's self or to others will not be exchanged for an imperative decree of the senses.

Recently some religious journals carried on a discussion of the question: Can science save us? They should have consulted Spinoza and Newman, and conserved their space for *open* questions. Science alone cannot save us. It can tell us, perhaps, how to solve certain menacing problems, but the will to solve those problems at all, or to solve them in the way suggested by science, is an indispensable prerequisite. That will, alas, is lacking.

How is good will to be created and developed? What can be done to make people fall in love, as it were, with justice and righteousness, to cause them to revolt against oppression, exploitation, piracy in modern forms, and demand a sound, stable, and humane economic order? William James spoke of tough minds and tender minds. Are we born either *hard*-hearted, callous, insensitive, indifferent to suffering of fellow-beings, or else kindly, benevolent, generous, *soft*-hearted? If we are not born either egoists or altruists, what do we know of the ways and means available to socialize our emotion, build character, strengthen our sympathies?

Neither psychologists, sociologists, nor ethicists are in agreement in respect to these fundamental questions. We ourselves are disposed to assert at certain times, or under certain influences, that there is an abundance of good will in the world, but a woeful deficiency in intelligence. The proverb has it that hell is paved with good intentions. But at other times we insist that our intelligence is equal to *any* enterprise, and that we simply do not *care* to apply that keen and developed intelligence to social and economic problems. Does not the abolition of poverty and misery seem a trivial task beside the marvels achieved in the realms of technology, physics, chemistry, and astronomy? We think of aviation, radio, canned music, wireless, surgery, the conquest of diseases once dreaded and deemed fatal, and we sadly say to ourselves that surely the problems of unemployment, business cycles, urban congestion, and destitution *cannot be* beyond the capacity of the human mind.

Again, books come to our aid and dispel such perplexities. Herbert Spencer in his *Education* and *The Principles of Ethics*, and John Dewey in his *Human Nature and Conduct* and elsewhere, have thrown welcome light on the foregoing questions. Heredity is much, but not everything, they tell us. We are born with all manner of potentialities for good and evil. Environment selects certain of our qualities and fosters them. The conduct of parents and relatives, the habits formed in childhood, the practice of the neighborhood and community, the example of admired teachers, the dramatization of past lives and the glorification of noble and heroic deeds—all these influences mold and shape our personalities. Environment acts only upon given hereditary material, to be sure, but that material is plastic and mutable. Attend to the habits of the young, says Dewey. Educate the emotions, as well as the intellect, says Spencer. Create a climate, an atmosphere, an environment with a definite social purpose, and the individual's innate tendencies will respond to and prosper in the environment. It is impossible for an individual to be moral in an immoral world, says Spencer, which is another way of saying that behavior is determined largely by the environment.

Education! What nonsense has been and still is being written on that subject! There is the quarrel between the so-called progressive schools and the old, conservative schools, the interminable controversies over the desirability of making education easy and pleasant, the need of discipline and self-discipline, the freedom of the student to select the branches of knowledge he will pursue in school or college. Extreme positions on these questions lead to absurdity, and can be burlesqued with devastating effects. No writer has dealt with education in a saner, soberer, more convincing way than H. G. Wells. It is not the college, he points out, which imposes these or those studies upon its charges. Nature and society make the selection and dictate the curriculum. No one today can ever *finish* his education. It is a lifelong process. The best educated persons are ignorant of many things. But common sense suggests that some knowledge is more essential than other to the average body of men and women. We must learn something about our planet, its history, and its place in the universe; something about the history of the human race; something about our economic, social, and political institutions; something about religion and philosophy; something about the human mind and the human body, something about letters and the fine arts. To be sure, the textbooks, the lectures, and the assigned supplementary reading on all these subjects should be made as interesting, absorbing, and exciting as possible, but the acquisition of knowledge is not *all* fun. Physical and mental application is requisite. Work is not an evil to be avoided. The most terrible thing in the world, as Anatole France says, is *ennui*, not work. Rest and recreation cannot be enjoyed unless work has preceded them. The normal man is not an idler; he longs to *use* his faculties creatively. He wants to master problems and to overcome difficulties. No one in modern times has rendered greater service to reasonable pacifism and Humanism than William James in his famous essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War." Man is a restless, ambitious, combative animal. He is not afraid of risks and danger. He is not deterred from fighting by reports or fiction depicting the horrors of war. Frightfulness in warfare does not force surrender; it merely begets reprisals of like or greater savagery.

Men fight because they are full of hate for some country or class. They fight because they are weary of drudgery and monotony, and crave adventure and excitement. They fight because they are ignorant and an easy prey to mendacious and vicious propaganda. They fight because they are envious and jealous, vain and proud, and bound to try to prove their superiority. Now, all these incentives cannot be exorcised by sermons or prayers. They will operate until equally powerful substitute incentives are gradually built up and called into action. We can do away with war only by giving men other than human foes to fight—nature, disease, superstition, and the like.

We waste time, energy, and money on futile and shallow arguments for or against war, and ignore two or three brief essays which finally and thoroughly solve the problem and prescribe a clear course of action. Verily, to the making of *superfluous* books there is no end.

On the deepest problem of all, the existence of what billions of men have called God, the last word to date, and perhaps for all time has been said by Darwin and by Spencer. This will seem a preposterous statement to the orthodox of all denominations, but the trouble with the orthodox is that they do not realize that they do not really believe what they believe they believe. They mistake what Spencer calls *pseudo* ideas for ideas. They use high sounding words without meaning.

What, if they stopped to reflect and to analyze their terms, would they give us as their definition of God? Many of them even talk of a personal God, though all they know of personality is derived, of course from their contacts and experiences with men, women, children, and animals. The painter necessarily portrays God as a man, and generally as a man past middle age, with a beard. If he is intelligent, he knows that his

imagination is utterly unequal to forming an image of God. When we talk about God's face, back, hand, footstool, and the like, we employ figures of speech, as we must but only the ignorant and foolish believe that God *looks* like a man, has the shape of a man, and lives like a man. Well, what does God, if He exists, look like? We do not know and cannot know. Here is what Darwin wrote in a letter on the subject:

> I may say that the impossibility of conceiving that this grand and wondrous universe, with our conscious selves, arose through chance seems to me the chief argument for the existence of God. I am aware that, if we admit a First Cause, the mind still craves to know whence it came about and how. The safest conclusion seems to me that the whole subject is beyond the scope of man's intellect.

The safest conclusion, Darwin says. It is, in fact, the only possible conclusion that has any meaning. All other conclusions are *pseudo* conclusions. They solve one mystery by falling back on another and greater mystery. They refuse to think beyond the point which, they allege, yields them great moral and spiritual comfort. But those who continue to inquire, criticize, think, and use words intelligently know that the orthodox solution is no solution at all. It gets rid of the grosser, primitive, and puerile conceptions of God by forming a sort of hypothesis which is too shadowy and empty to admit of examination. Neither science nor common sense can do anything with such hypotheses.

Spencer adds little to Darwin's humble conclusion. But he is more elaborate in his treatment of the subject, more philosophical and more emphatic. He does not use the term God, preferring the phrase, "the power from which all things proceed." That power, he argues, is inscrutable, inconceivable, unknowable. Well, is it not? Man, finite man, a part of Nature, would indeed be presumptuous and childish were he to hope ever to form a clear conception of that power. If this be true —and no one since Spencer wrote his *First Principles* has even seriously attempted to refute the argument— it follows that it is idle for man to seek to answer the questions whence the power came, how it was itself caused, and what laws, if any, govern its operations.

We must resign ourselves to ignorance of the nature and quality of the power in question. To think of it as "personal" is naively anthropomorphic. We can study its manifestations in ourselves and in the rest of nature. We cannot pray to an unknowable and inconceivable power, but, if the facts warrant it, we may infer that the power, on the whole, makes for what we humans call goodness, virtue, and progress. Nothing we do can be *anti*-natural, and nothing else in the universe can be contrary to the laws of nature. We human beings have evolved certain notions of morality, and we are certain that these notions, if applied, lessen friction and conflict in society and improve human life in all of its aspects. We have evolved conceptions of duty, right, and beauty which we are anxious to share with others. We have visions and ideals, and an inner urge to realize these ideals. All these things, we hold, are in harmony with the design which we dimly perceive in the human corner of the cosmos. In doing our duty as civilized beings we feel we are coöperating with the power in, behind, and over nature. All this is proper and legitimate. But more we cannot assert.

There are those who say that this view tends to gloomy pessimism. To pessimism, yes, but not to gloomy pessimism. Human life, according to Schopenhauer, is essentially tragic. But it does not follow that we cannot and do not keenly enjoy life. Philosophically, there is no escape from pessimism. Temperamentally, few of us can long maintain a pessimistic attitude. Schopenhauer may affirm that nature tricks us, administers powerful narcotics to us in the form of music, poetry, polished, gracious intercourse, and what not, in order to prevent us from sinking into melancholy, and attempting self-destruction. The fact remains that we find pleasure and delight in the fine arts, in gracious social relations, in the contemplation of natural beauty, in travel, and in other things, and this means that we enjoy life, and do not wish to lose it. We do not, that is, *act* like pessimists.

The same answer may be made to the contention that disbelief in individual immortality, or survival after death, must reduce us to despair and contempt for life. Paul E. More, in his *Scientific Approach to Religion,* meaning orthodox Christianity, passionately protests against the notion that we can be, or ought to be, content with race immortality. If, he says, the individual is not immortal, then a cruel and bitter jest has been perpetrated on humanity. For, he contends, we *long* for survival after death, cling to the belief in such survival, and realize that our gifts and peculiar qualities, the qualities that make us men and women, are never put to full use in our short span of earthly existence; and extinction, therefore, would be a terrible waste of precious resources.

Mr. More's argument is singularly weak and unimpressive. It is not true that all men are born with an instinctive faith in personal immortality. It is not even true that all men desire such immortality. The belief in immortality is a product of education by theologians and philosophers who have convinced themselves that certain writings, called inspired or divine, have revealed to humanity the fact of immortality. There is no evidence that the belief would arise spontaneously and naturally in one not reared and instructed by adherents of pre-scientific theologies and cosmologies. There is said to be considerable evidence to the contrary.

Not all men long for personal immortality. Yet it must be confessed—and Professor T. H. Huxley did confess—that a sort of horror flashes across our minds on occasions when we stop to think of death as the end of our conscious existence. This, however, is perfectly natural, but it is equally natural that our intelligence should make peace with the inevitable and conclude that the course of practical wisdom is to make our brief span of life as significant, abundant, and useful as possible. The cultivated and thoughtful man does not resent his fate. He meets it with courage and stoicism. He knows that human energies and faculties decline with age; that even great intellects have lapsed into dotage or second childhood; that in the vast majority of cases death does *not* deprive humanity of any important additions to the stock of culture or knowledge. It is gratuitous to suppose that had Bach and Beethoven lived several decades longer than they did, the western world would be richer by another dozen symphonies or another score of beautiful suites, fugues, chorales, and preludes. Mr. More's argument seems to imply that Bach and Beethoven, Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare continue to produce master works somewhere in some form, thus duly fulfilling themselves and conferring further benefits on—on whom, pray? Not on human beings as we know them, surely. On disembodied spirits, or angels?

The believers in individual immortality, or survival

after death, do not know just what they believe in. They cannot frame any intelligible formula for their alleged belief. No wonder Professor Ernest Hocking of Harvard felt constrained in his recent little book on the subject to reject immortality for a new and startling concept—that of immortability. Only the élite, the aristocracy of humanity, he thinks, is worthy of survival or capable and desirous of it. The average man or woman has nothing to contribute, and had better die for good. The few who have intellectual or moral genius deserve to be, and are, preserved. It hardly needs saying that Professor Hocking knows no more than the Agnostics do *where* those exceptional persons are preserved, in what form, and for what purpose. His compromise suggestion is not acceptable to the orthodox, since it sacrifices the immortal human soul, and is too unsubstantial to challenge or interest the Agnostics. Huxley would ask: Why imagine vain things? Why not say modestly and honestly, "we do not know and cannot know"? Personal survival after death are words wholly devoid of meaning to us. It is another pseudo idea.

The old controversy between the upholders of determinism and the champions of human free will was, for me, rendered empty and absurd by the discovery in Spencer's *Principles of Psychology* of the simple fact that there is no such entity as "will." The term is convenient, and we use it as we do shorthand and symbols. But all that we can possibly mean when we speak of a strong will, a weak will, a good will, or a bad will is that some person so acts normally as to indicate that he or she seldom hesitates, suffers from no internal conflicts, and is dominated by some strong or overmastering passion; or that another person vacillates and drifts and evades a decision. The ruling passion is the so-called will. It may be a passion for power, a passion for money, or a passion for righteousness. To say that the passion is free is nonsense. Our actions are dictated by instincts, impulses, desires. We think we are free to act simply because we cannot be sure, in advance, *which* of our desires will prevail and which will be resisted. Mass behavior is predictable; individual conduct is so only in certain clear cases. There is no freedom of choice in any case.

But, it is objected, if man is a machine and his actions are determined by causes open to study and analysis, what becomes of morality, of progress, of education? Professor J. W. Herrick has ably answered that question. It is precisely because man is a machine that education can influence him, that his morals can be steadily improved and his progress deliberately planned and furthered. Because man is a machine, we know what to expect from discipline, from cultivated habits, from environment, from indoctrination.

The universe is governed by law, and we are a part of the universe. The notion of causelessness, of so-called indeterminacy, is preposterous. We may not understand all the operations of nature, especially of minute particles in nature, but that is due to our poor instruments. We may or may not, in the future, improve our instruments and facilities for the study of atoms and the constituents of atoms. Meantime our imperfect knowledge does not warrant the assertion that there is "freedom" or caprice somewhere in nature, physical or super-physical.

Take another great controversial question—the existence or non-existence of a "law" of progress. Is human progress certain and inevitable; that is, are we so constituted that we are bound to advance toward a cherished and desirable goal? Professors Bury and John Dewey have treated this subject with scientific care and accuracy. We no longer cling to the naive belief of the eighteenth century that social and moral progress is steady and uninterrupted. Alas, we know better now. Long periods of stagnation and even actual retrogression and dehumanization are possible. Whole societies have been rebarbarized, and lawless, vulgar gangster governments have been permitted to flout all the principles of civilized decency. Quackery has been substituted for science, and educators have been muzzled and regimented. No, progress is not inevitable. There is no assurance that another dark age is not ahead of us.

But we also know that those of us who favor and want progress in social, economic, and political fields can and will work and fight for it, and that the period of stagnation or retrogression will be succeeded by one of resumed progress. No tyrant or savage can destroy civilization, he can only interrupt it. He cannot burn all the humane and enlightened books, nor kill the sentiments and ideas which characterize human culture and civilization. Rebellious groups can be terrorized for a while, and reduced to silence and submission; they cannot be permanently suppressed and disarmed; they certainly cannot be converted to falsehood and folly. The Hitlers and Mussolinis are offensive and obscene nuisances, but they are short-lived nuisances. Like murder, intellectual and moral fraud will "out." The masses eventually tire of noise, humbug, bombastic oratory, bragging and bluffing, and turn to sober, honest, and reasonable leaders. Cruelty, sadism, and insane hate at last burn themselves out, and the ideals of humanity and justice reëmerge and claim allegiance and devotion. We have some ground for hoping that both our business cycles and our moral cycles will be replaced by stability and healthy, if slow, advance. If this hope be vain, then Spengler was right, and civilizations, like human beings, have their youth, middle age, decline, and death.

In the foregoing paragraphs, I have shown just how books of the first order or category, books really worth reading and re-reading have solved, for many, the most serious, profound and complex problems of civilized human societies. Some of the solutions, I assert, are final; others are subject to revision in the light of additional data. Let me now turn to problems which no school or thinker claims to have solved, but which are being studied today more scientifically and more realistically than ever before, and which are creating literatures no educated person can afford to ignore. What, for example, is evolution, or revolution, doing to the family, to marriage, to the relation between parents and children? What effect has Russian Bolshevism had on sex morals and manners? Has Russia destroyed family life? Has she preserved monogamy? Has she done away with prostitution and conferred upon the woman a new status, one of dignity, independence, equality? Are Russia's laws of marriage and divorce likely to appeal to more civilized societies? Bertrand Russell favors trial marriages, and so did George Meredith. Is that idea as shocking today as it was thirty years ago?

How has psychoanalysis and its emphasis on the unconscious affected our thinking? Is Marxism consonant with Freudian and Jungian interpretations of

social and individual ills? The more enlightened Freudians have discarded certain early notions concerning sex and its place in life, and are rediscovering what they call the total personality. They recognize that individual problems are often social problems, for which the environment is largely responsible. These are no longer anti-reform. Even Russia would not dismiss them as counter-revolutionary. But what is their contribution to thought? We know that nothing in life is static, and that our conceptions of morality and propriety are bound to undergo modification in sympathy with the trends and developments in science, economics, politics, and social customs. The long view corrects the unavoidable mistakes of the short view. Travel in space kills provincialism; travel in time kills fanatical devotion to transitory and ephemeral dogmas. Institutions are made for man, not man for institutions. If man is worth saving and perpetuating, we may trust him to establish fit and worthy institutions.

We often hear it said that the individual no longer counts, and that there is no good reason why he should take a serious interest in, and devote time and energy to public affairs. Let the individual pursue his own happiness, we are told, and renounce all missionary activities. These are fallacious ideas. Happiness cannot be pursued directly, nor in a social vacuum. We are members of one another, and we need one another. We cannot be happy unless we give expression to our powers and capabilities. Happiness is a by-product of such expression. We can and do count individually, if we coöperate with our fellows and act collectively. Organization and coöperation do not preclude leadership. And leaders carry weight and exert influence on events only if they are backed by intelligent and active followers. A victory for your party, group, or organization is a victory for you.

Since I am not writing a book, but only a paper, I feel that I must stop. But I must say a word or two about books versus direct, vital, personal experiences. We can learn things in two ways only—by assimilating and accepting what others have said, generally in books, or by personal observations, contacts, and experimentation. Most of us enjoy very limited opportunities for observation and experimentation; we depend largely, therefore, on books—that is, the recorded observations and conclusions of others. When books contradict our own personal conclusions, we reject them emotionally and stick to our personal conclusions. This is inevitable, in view of what William James called "the tyranny of the concrete fact." One observed or experienced fact makes a deeper and more lasting impression on us than do a hundred books. I recall an amusing incident illustrative of this truth. I once delivered a long lecture, before a woman's club, on trade unions, their necessity, legitimacy, and social utility. I argued; I cited facts, and I gave figures. One very intelligent woman took sharp exception to my views, because she had had a rather unpleasant experience with a member of a plumbers' union, who, very likely, *was* unreasonable, rude, and arrogant. I did not blame her; she was obeying a psychological law. Yet my argument was sound, and there *is a scientific case* for trade unions and collective bargaining.

We must read books critically and we must, in addition, seek *direct* knowledge of life and human nature. The narrow life, the isolated life, produces intolerance, ignorance, prejudice, and callousness; the rich, dynamic life engenders understanding and sympathy. But life is short and individual experience necessarily limited. Books take us into the past and into the future. Books insure continuity of culture. They conserve and preserve what is best in civilization while enabling us to discard the worst—that is, the outworn, the discredited, the false. To die ignorant, said Carlyle, that is the real tragedy. Not to know how to use and enjoy books is to court ignorance.

The Living Bible

A. J. BAHM

The Bible has been interpreted in many ways. Let us here interpret it as a story, a story of the lives of men, men who, in a remarkable way, exemplified the struggles, the temptations, the hopes and aspirations of all men.

The Jews were a chosen people in a very significant sense. They and their problems, their trials and tribulations, their woe and their wisdom, have been chosen to exemplify, for men of many centuries, the great quest for the better life. The story of their lives has been chosen for us to read, has been chosen to serve as a guide, that we might profit by their discoveries and benefit by their mistakes.

The Bible is often called "the Word of God." Let us consider the Bible as a story, not only of men but also of God. The story of God and the story of men are not separate stories. They are one and the same. For men are dependent on God, and God, in turn, is dependent on men. God has his being in and through men, as well as in and through the rest of creation.

The story of man's dependence upon God has been told so often and in so many ways that it is well-known. This story is more familiar to ministers than to laymen, more familiar to theologians and metaphysicians than to ministers.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Church, New York Area, long ago wrote a book entitled, *Is God Limited?* Bishop McConnell's answer is "Yes," and he points out many ways in which God is limited. He also points out why it is more desirable to believe that God is limited as he is, than to believe that he is unlimited, perfect, omnipotent and omniscient. If God were really omnipotent, he would have no need of men. But a limited God, a dependent God, depends upon men for help, in the struggle between the forces of good and evil. Men are important to God because of God's nature.

Consider some common phrases:

"God is a God of love." Who could God love, if there were no men? Is he not dependent upon men to be the objects of his love?

"God is a God of mercy." If there were not men, unto whom could he show mercy? How could God be merciful, if there were no one to be merciful unto?

There is another kind of dependence of God upon men. It has to do with the question of progress. Is God a progressive God, or is he static, finished, complete? If God is finished, how can we be of any help to him in the struggle? How could there be a plan for future salvation, if, for God, the end is already reached?

I believe that God is unfinished, that he is progressive, that he is growing and developing, and, despite all his goodness, he is still improving. He is progressing not alone by himself, but with, or rather in and through, his creatures. He is progressing through us. Our progress is his progress, and surely also his progress is ours. Insofar as he progresses through us, he depends upon us for his progress.

Surely these ideas are neither unfamiliar nor too abstruse. They have been epitomized by a simple rhyme which we used to sing in primary Sunday School:

God has no hands but our hands
To do his work today;
He has no feet but our feet
To guide men in his way.
He has no tongue but our tongues
To tell men how he died,
He has no help but our help
To bring them to his side.

The Bible is a story of progress, a story of the progress of God through his creatures. So long as there is progress of God through his creatures, there will be a story of that progress. A small part of that story has been written, copied, translated, preserved in what we call the Bible. But there is a part of that story which has not yet been written. And there is a part of that story which is being written today. Even if the story is not being recorded actually, it is being lived. This story of God's progress through our lives today I like to call "the Living Bible."

The last page of my Bible is page 916, and near the bottom of the page are found the words, "The End." But there is no end to the Living Bible. The Bible book is finished. But the Living Bible is unfinished. The story of God, living and progressing through our lives today, is a continuing story.

If this story is a story of progress, we may ask has progress really been made? Are we better now than people were in centuries past? If so, ought not the story of today be better in some respects than the story of centuries past? Must we not have faith in Christian progress—human progress which is also God's progress? Must we not have faith that the story of the Living Bible is a better story today than it was in the past?

What is the story as it would be told today? That question I cannot answer. For the answer would include the story of all the lives of all men. Who could tell such a story? Such a story would include the story of civilization. Historically, civilizations have risen and fallen, always to rise higher. Each catastrophe and each collapse has served to stimulate further progress. Every mistake has meant a new lesson learned, a new stage, a higher climb.

Economically, we have progressed from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance. Socially, we have progressed from a mass poverty which was nobody's business to national social security. Politically, we have progressed from patriarchy to democracy. Religiously, we have progressed from family and state religions to extensive denominational pluralism, and now, we hope, religious progress will swing toward greater unity. Educationally, we have progressed from mother's knee, through the little red school house, to universal education. Scientifically, we have progressed from primitive magic of medicine men to giant research laboratories. This is all a part of the story of God's world.

If the story of science is a part of the story of the Living Bible, what about science and religion? Some think that science and religion conflict. But I see no good reason why this should be so. Of course, particular scientists and particular religionists conflict. But so do some scientists with other scientists and so do some religionists with other religionists. Surely those who believe that science and religion conflict are among those who have had the veil drawn less farther away. Recall the passage in First Corinthians, Chapter 13, translated and interpreted in various ways, which reads something like this: "For now we see as through a veil darkly, but then we shall see clearly as though face to face." The veil of ignorance has been lifted gradually. Revelations came to men of old in many ways and they come today in many ways. The story of revelation in the Living Bible is increasingly a story of science. Progress in science is progress in revelation—is progress in removing the veil of ignorance. Progress is slow, but steady.

There are those who conceive God as a God of magic. They believe that some day he will miraculously rip away the veil of ignorance and men will become omniscient in a moment, without men having done much to remove the veil themselves. It would be nice to have it done that way, but whether it will or not, we know that as we help in the struggle against ignorance, some progress is being made.

The second point to be considered has to do with the teaching of religion. College communities are confronted with the problem of helping young people to make an adequate religious adjustment. Many of them come to college with their minds already made up that the Bible is not all true, some come with disturbing doubts. Some with mere suspicions. Doubting and thinking continue in college. Colleges are often condemned as radical or irreligious. But is there not much confusion between radicalism and progress? When a boy comes home from college, or home from anywhere where he may have rubbed shoulders with people having different ideas, he tends to bring back some different ideas. If he does not, he has been wasting his time. One should expect to learn something new in college. If his new ideas are religious, his home-town folks are likely to think he has lost his faith, and to call him a backslider. But it is sometimes hard to distinguish between backsliding and progress. Jesus ushered in a new era of progress, but his home-town folks crucified him as a backslider, and hung him with the thieves. But God's progress goes on, nevertheless.

How shall we teach religion to our young people? Only out of the Bible of the past, or also out of the Living Bible? I should think we should teach them in whatever way gets the job done best. Some can read the Bible better; some cannot read it at all. Those whose religious needs are adequately satisfied by the Bible give teachers little trouble. But those who cannot understand the contemporary significance of stories of centuries ago, who cannot appreciate the vocabulary and grammar of early English translators, who cannot easily connect the parables of ancient rural life with the metropolitan puzzles of today—they need urgent attention.

With stream-lined transportation, world-wide radio communication, exciting movies, illustrated magazines, modernized homes, automats and curb service, it seems a bit incongruous to some of our youth to be expected to get their religious guidance from centuries-old stories, translated into an outmoded vernacular. If they cannot understand, it is our job to help them. And it may be that the best way to do this is by speaking the language of today. This would not be the first time that religious progress came through linguistic progress. The Protestant Reformation was significant partly because the new leaders spoke and wrote in the vernacular, the language the people understood. Some of our young people think it is again time to protest, that it is time for another reformation which will provide leaders who can speak and write in their vernacular. If an older generation is unable or unwilling to understand the language of a younger generation well enough to translate its wisdom into understandable terms, then the younger generation may have to do without. But being without such wisdom does not mean they will be without religion. Man is incurably religious. And surely he can be religious in newer and better ways.

Teaching religion to young people is not merely a matter of adequate language. It is a matter also of adequate example. Biblical examples are multitudinous. And they are adequate for many needs. Yet, somehow, they do not always seem vital to youth today. The simple relations in the story of the Good Samaritan should be understood by every generation. But in a day of scare headlines, pyramided corporations, secret diplomacy, there are complicated relations which are not so easily understood. We have drawn analogies between the simple stories and our complex social problems, and in stretching them to fit, we have been marvelously ingenious. But there are points beyond which they do not stretch.

For example, consider three commandments: "Thou shall not lie, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not kill." Today, as yesterday, obvious lying, stealing, killing is considered bad. But does lying include half-truths in headlines? Does stealing include corporation price-manipulations which hurt competitors, stockholders, or consumers? Does killing include slow death to city babies resulting from milk strikes, or foreign famine due to international economic competition? Vivid examples of Christian actions in these situations are hard to find, even by analogy, in records of lives of long ago.

Where is the story of the editor who does not write scare headlines just because they do not tell the whole truth? Where is the corporation director who refuses to lower prices just because this would hurt a competing corporation? Where is the statesman who votes against the tariff requests of his constituents, just because he knows people in other countries are in greater need of the tariff advantage? These rare stories are parts of our Living Bible. They are stories which our students of journalism, economics, and politics can understand.

The third point to be considered has to do with us —with our lives as examples. We are the editors, directors, statesmen. We are the businessmen, salesmen, merchants. We are the teachers, voters, citizens. We are the examples which others can understand. Our lives are the books they cannot fail to read. Ours is a job of making them good reading. The story of the Living Bible is a story of our lives, a story written and read by someone seven days of every week, a story that is easy to read. It is a story that is easily understood, easily remembered, easily imitated. What kind of a story are we writing? What kind of a tale do we tell? What does God gain through our lives?

Suppose, perchance, some new collectors of sacred stories sought to record examples of the Living Bible today? Suppose God's growth demanded a Newer Testament. Then, where would we find the Matthews, Marks, and Lukes today? Would your life be a worthy candidate exemplifying Christian progress? How would you rate as one of the chosen people? How good would God seem to readers of God in your life? Let us test ourselves with these questions. If we come short of the mark of our high calling, then let us let God live within us more completely.

The three points presented may be summarized: First, the living Bible, as a story of the progress of God through the progress of men, is an unfinished story. It is a story which includes scientific and social progress, and progress in the spirit of brotherhood among men. Second, the teaching of religion to young people today may be facilitated if they are taught also from the Living Bible, and in their own vernacular. Third, the Living Bible is the story of our own lives, and responsibility for the way it reads rests upon us.

Hitlerism in America

MYLES D. BLANCHARD

Recently Miss Dorothy Thompson booted herself to near-hysteria while lamenting that there were so few boys in our land ready and willing to die for democracy. Miss Thompson is past hope, and to try to convert her to the idea of bulwarking democracy by creating more of it rather than curtailing what little we have is to waste time. But it might be well for us all to sit down and calmly decide if we would be saving democracy by going to Europe and fighting for it.

To begin with, just how much democracy have we here in our own United States?

I have before me as I write a letter signed by Captain L. C. Reeve, Captain of Police, City of Coral Gables, Florida. It says:

> Reference is made to your letter of November 27, 1940. All colored people that are employed in the City of Coral Gables are required to have an employment card (which we call an identification card) when they are working in the Gables. This card does have the picture and the fingerprints of the party on the same.

A similar law is enforced in the great and growing city of Miami Beach, Florida. A white man found in the section of Miami given over to Negroes ("nigger section," in the South) can be arrested if he is there after dark, and a Negro can

be arrested on suspicion if he is found in downtown Miami after nine at night.

The Constitution of this great democracy guarantees the right of franchise to every American citizen regardless of race or sex. But the Constitution is nothing but a rag of pulp paper insofar as a vast section of this country is concerned. The Democratic Party (note the name) of Texas has been upheld by the courts of this land when it refuses to extend the privilege of franchise to the Negroes of that state. This might seem like a minor offense against decency were it not for the fact that, barred from voting in the Democratic primaries, these Negroes cannot vote at all since there is no Republican party worth mentioning in the entire South.

I was a citizen of Miami, Florida, for nearly three years and during my stay there the Ku Klux Klan of that city rode into the negro section, distributed cards upon which were printed "Respectable Niggers Don't Vote," and then, as if to safeguard against any possible ignoring of this threat, they hanged a Negro in effigy to a light-pole.

A certain Miami white clergyman, should he care to talk, could tell of being beaten up by the Miami Klan because he tried to save two harmless and small negro boys from a terrific whipping by members of the Klan as they drove through the colored section.

Reverend "Dick" Evans of Miami, featured by *Liberty Magazine* as a promoter of real democracy in Florida, and a prominent Legionnaire, has yet to raise his strident voice against the fact that his brother Legionnaires in that state have to this date refused to allow the negro veterans of Florida the right of becoming members of the American Legion.

The South is the only section of the civilized world that deliberately builds slums. It is in this country and not in Europe that those seeking quick returns on small investments build shacks, filthy and unsanitary, in which colored people are segregated. They are as efficiently walled into that section of the city as though Hitler had a thousand storm troopers surrounding the area.

In our great democracy the Negro of the South is made to ride over the wheels in interstate busses; he is crowded into smelly waiting rooms reserved for him; he is denied food at company-owned restaurants; and he cannot ride on limited busses. The amount spent on him for education is a mere pittance, since the theory is that an educated "nigger" is a dangerous one to have around. He is made to work for less pay because of his color, and he must never come to the front door of a white man's house, nor eat at his table, nor sit in his front room if he is below the Mason-Dixon line.

Not so long ago the Ku Klux Klan raided a white Baptist church in Miami where a group of negro men were singing their spirituals. Down the aisle came the Klanners, interrupting the service. They told the white pastor of the church that he was violating the written and unwritten law of that city by even having the Negroes under the same roof with his white congregation. It was also in this city that a Federal Theatre production (note that it was under the auspices of the United States Government) was held up until the Negroes were cleared out of the balcony.

It is a high and noble thing for Miss Thompson to demand that somebody else's boy fight to save democracy in Europe where they have never had it to begin with. But I have yet to hear her raise her clear stentorian voice against the lack of democracy as evidenced in our handling of twelve million men and women whose only sin is that they are not of Miss Thompson's color.

This is not a war to save democracy. If it were we would strengthen what little we have here in America rather than crush it day by day. A few years ago it was a hellish matter that Hitler had solved the unemployment problem in Germany by a huge military program that resulted in a military economy. But today America is doing the same thing and if anyone opposes such a program he is a fifth columnist. It was a damnable thing for Hitler to put the Jews into concentration camps, but it has been all right for the descendants of Jefferson Davis to do it in this country to Negroes.

I am opposed to Hitler and I pride myself that there are millions like me in America. But I am not only opposed to him in Germany; I am opposed to him over here, too.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXX

The *Nofrontier News Service* publishes the following from London:

"The army of men without hate" is at work in England again. Manned by conscientious objectors, it is now working from two camps on projects of forestry in various regions of the country. This international organization of good will is little known in America, but to Englishmen, and especially to Welshmen, the name of Pierre Ceresole and the International Civilian Service which he and his father founded in Switzerland in 1920, is remembered with gratitude.

It was in 1931 that a call for help went out from poverty-stricken Welsh mining towns. One in particular, Brynmawr, in South Wales, had a population of eight thousand which had not been able to work the mines and had therefore been unemployed for nine years. In answer to the call came first the Quakers, and then Pierre Ceresole and the International Civil Service. Volunteers from many lands set to work to rebuild the town, cleaning up the ugly coal pits, replacing them with playgrounds, pools, and parks. They taught the natives new industries and helped them get started with a little furniture factory, bootmaking, weaving, and poultry industries. When the volunteers left, the whole town had been transformed into a beautiful, happy, busy community.

Brynmawr is only one of many communities in many lands that know Ceresole's work. When the little principality of Lichtenstein was devastated by a severe Rhine River flood, which destroyed houses and covered the fields with boulders

and sand so that it seemed the whole district would have to be abandoned, Ceresole led an army of volunteers from 22 countries in a six months' struggle. At the end of that time the fields had been cleared, houses rebuilt, and crops had begun growing for the amazed and grateful farmers.

The idea behind this work by war resisters of all countries is expressed by Pierre Ceresole himself. "I am tired of talk," he has said. "A hundred men and women may talk about peace and world brotherhood and the world takes no notice. If we get 20 men to do a little useful work with pick and shovel people will look and take notice."

In England, the service is now giving an opportunity to men and women, conscientiously opposed to taking part in any war activity, a chance to demonstrate once again their willingness to coöperate in efforts to improve international relations and build a solid base for a real peace. They are being led by a Swiss, who has written back to the headquarters in Geneva: "This camp is perfect. The forty-odd participants are good fellows and the collaboration is ideal. In spite of the very heavy work and the long hours on Saturdays and Sundays, they are alert and cheerful, lending a hand to neighbors wherever they can. The spirit is certainly better than in many of our previous camps."

In an article in the *Union Signal,* organ of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Dr. Walter Van Kirk reports:

The National Peace Conference, made up of the representatives of forty national organizations interested in the peace problem, has arrived at a consensus of judgment with respect to the following four points:

First: Keep the United States out of war; Second: Coöperation by the United States with other nations in the establishment of a genuine world government; Third: Strengthen the institutions of American democracy; Fourth: Promotion of Inter-American solidarity.

Speaking of the first point, "keep the United States out of war," Dr. Van Kirk writes:

With the outbreak of war in Europe the National Peace Conference recommended to its constituent organizations a statement of policy in which it was said: "We are unanimously of the conviction that the United States must not be drawn into military conflict." Despite the untoward events of recent months the leaders of the American peace movement still adhere to this purpose. To my knowledge there is not a single peace organization in the country that recommends American involvement in war. I was authorized by many of the organizations of the National Peace Conference to present to the platform committees of the Republican and Democratic Conventions a strong anti-war plank. Both of our major political parties have declared that military, naval, and air forces of the United States are not to be used in a foreign war. The peace movement holds the party in power responsible for the fulfillment of this pledge.

The *Nofrontier News Service* publishes the following dispatch from Melbourne, Australia:

The Christian Pacifist Movement, numbering 630 members in Victoria, has applied for affiliation with the War Resisters International.

The *Christian Century* carries the following report:

Reaffirming its contention that peacetime conscription is "at once a serious menace to our democratic way of life and an affront to Christian reverence for personality," the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, meeting in Chicago, asked for repeal of the draft act and opposed "any further extension of conscription, whether to men or women." The commission also expressed the opinion that non-military service on a voluntary basis, such as Quaker work camps, should be rendered available to young people through the various religious and civil agencies. Agreeing that the United States should refuse to become a belligerent in Europe or in the Far East, the commission declared that "this judgment is based not on a policy of national isolation, but on the conviction that the United States can best serve the world by preserving democracy within its own borders, providing relief for stricken populations and assisting in the physical reconstruction of a war-shattered world."

The *Christian News-Letter,* published in Oxford, England, has the following statement by its Editor, the Reverend J. H. Oldham:

The whole nation has been moved to sympathy with the sufferings of Coventry. The attack revealed afresh both the spirit and resource of our people and the savagery and senselessness of modern war. Grievous as is the loss of the beautiful mediaeval cathedral, the celebration of the Holy Communion as usual on the following Sunday in the drawing-room of the Provost reminds us that the living home of the Christian faith is in the wills and affections of men and not in the monuments of their hands.

A headline in a Sunday paper, splashed in large letters over the front page, ran: "Please God, you will avenge what was done to us that night." The words are reported to have been whispered in the ruined cathedral to a young airman in a pilot's uniform. To such contrary meaning can the faith which inspired the building of the cathedral be turned.

We believe that for the sake of the political well-being of mankind the war must be stubbornly prosecuted. Modern methods of warfare require that the enemy's supplies of material be bombed from the air. Through such action the lives and homes of the common people in Germany will be destroyed. But we do not desire this suffering and loss of life; we have no heart to exult in it. It does nothing to alleviate our sorrow for those who have been stricken in our own land to know that homes have been desolated in Germany. If Christianity means anything, it means that the heart of Christ grieves with the same tenderness for every German or Italian child that is killed or maimed as for every child who suffers in Great Britain. Unless we hold to this truth through the passions of war, there will not be enough pity and compassion to rebuild the shattered world.

The Kansas City Council of Churches and the Presbyterian Churches of Indianapolis have taken action to safeguard the interests of conscientious objectors appearing before local draft boards. The Presbyterians of Indianapolis propose that conscientious objectors "shall have the support of the Presbyterian Church in preparing their cases."

The Cleveland correspondent of the *Christian Century* reports the following:

The Ohio Grange represents a little publicized but important section of public opinion. At its 68th annual convention here last week this representative farm group reaffirmed a long standing opposition to war and called for the strengthening of democracy at home and the improving of relations abroad. It also resolved that "not a single American boy be sent to fight in the wars of Europe or Asia" and that "war profits should be eliminated as far as possible at this time of national emergency."

Winter

Among skeleton trees
Covered with shroud like snow
A tall, straight pine
Lifts a head toward heaven
And shakes the snow from bright green coat.
Gazing on this tree of life-in-death
My heart warms with hope.
I pray like Ezekiel of old:
"Come from the four winds, oh breath,
And breathe upon these slain
That they may live."
When snow, wind and storm are gone
The sap of growth must flow again.
Another life must be.

LUCY GOODE LAW.

The Study Table

Religion and Religions

ESSENCE OF RELIGIONS. *By Kedarnath Das Gupta. New York: World Fellowship of Faiths, 49 West 44th Street.* $1.50.

Mr. Das Gupta is an Indian, long known and admired in his own country, England, and America, for his substantial work in behalf of peace, brotherhood, and the unity of mankind. A profoundly religious man, he has naturally approached his problem from the religious point of view, and has thus for years labored on behalf of the World Fellowship of Faiths. This book on religious movements and ideals is the fine fruit of his thought and of his utter devotion to his cause. It is at once the analysis and the proclamation of the faith that has fed the fires of his soul.

The first thing notable about this book is its simplicity and clarity. Here is the content of great religions stated in a few pages of accurate and illuminating exposition. The title of the volume tells it all—this is the "essence" of these faiths.

A second notable feature is the comprehensiveness, or rather the inclusiveness of the book. Indian religions are treated more numerously and extensively than others, partly perhaps because Mr. Das Gupta is himself an Indian, more likely because India may fittingly be called "the mother of religions." Here Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, the Brahmo-Samaj, and even Gandhism, are all remembered. But other faiths of other lands are not neglected. Six religions of China, Judaism and Christianity (in its Catholic and Protestant forms) and Islam, also Zoroastrianism, Bahaism, Mormonism, Rosicrucianism, Spiritualism, Theosophy, New Thought, Ethical Culture, Positivism, Humanism—they are all here! Even the Community Church of New York is included, along with Mr. Das Gupta's own Fellowship, as an exemplification of the universal aspects of religion.

Mr. Das Gupta is scholarly as well as clear. He is profoundly appreciative of principles and values. There is not a trace of parochialism in his thought, nor of bigotry in his heart. He is free of every last taint of dogmatism. A prophet of the one God, a lover of all mankind, an apostle of peace, pure in heart, humble in spirit, this man is a living witness of his faith. This book is his testament, to be welcomed, and I trust widely used, as a textbook of religion and religions in our time.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Philosophy of Religious Education

CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BE CHRISTIAN? *By Harrison S. Elliott. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 338 *pp.* $2.50.

The present reviewer has a profound interest in every book dealing with the theory or philosophy of religious education. He recalls vividly spending an entire summer vacation with Professor Coe's *Social Theory of Religious Education.* And a most rewarding vacation it was. The present book, too, is packed to repletion with interesting fact, theory, history, and philosophy. It is positively amazing that so much can be tucked into three hundred-odd pages. The educational approach here is from the viewpoint of what the author calls neo-orthodoxy. But the history that precedes is a recapitulation of the interesting educational development of American Protestantism. The chapter on "Religious Education and the Use of the Bible" is a sort of history of criticism with its influence on the subject of Bible reading and Bible influence. An American scholar is now at work on a book showing what effect the criticism of the Bible has had. Much stress is laid by Dr. Elliott on "human nature." But what is religious education going to do about "the human predicament"? The author believes that our difficulties will be solved not so much by trying to make persons intelligent as by getting them to coöperate in good will. And in this he is probably right. Get this book, read it, and then re-read it.

C. A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 146)

simply moral and spiritual, arising from the selfishness and cruelty of man, but also economic and political, arising from blunders and ignorance. We agree that in the responsibility for these sins and mistakes we all share—neutrals as well as belligerents, those whose cause we believe to be more just as well as those whom we believe to be more in the wrong.

We agree that in the effort to eliminate war, we must all share—each in the way his conscience can approve. The pacifists should not be content simply to protest against war but must accept their full responsibility for finding some form of positive program to prevent it. Those who advocate granting moral or material aid to the opponents of the axis powers must assume their proper share of responsibility for the peace which is to follow the war.

In the meantime, there are inescapable duties on which we all agree and which admit no delay. As Christian citizens in the face of a great calamity, we must practice sacrificial private benevolence, and we must also urge our government to make still more generous provision from public funds for the relief and rehabilitation of the multitudes who have been left homeless and destitute. As churchmen we have a special responsibility to our fellow-Christians in the warring and in the neutral countries to help them sustain the institutions of religion and to assume support of that part of their missionary work which for the moment they are unable to carry on.

We agree that we must resolutely maintain the bonds of our ecumenical fellowship, in spite of the strains of war, with Christians in all lands. To preserve and strengthen this fellowship, which centers in the World Council of Churches now in process of formation, is to make our most distinctive contribution to international understanding and good will. We agree also that we have a similar responsibility to maintain fellowship among Christians of differing views in our own country and to protect the rights of all those who, because of race or any other reason, may be brought under unjust suspicion.

Above all we must maintain faith that even though political and economic systems crash to ruin, the moral order of the universe still stands. The Christian church emerged in a world dominated by a philosophy of might and challenged by a political system that totally disregarded the rights of Christian conscience. More than once since that time nations have turned their backs upon God only to find that God cannot be mocked with impunity nor His purpose for the world circumvented. It is man's failure to conform to God's order, as revealed in Jesus Christ, that has brought the world to its present chaos. Our supreme task, therefore, is to be His witnesses to a world that so largely repudiates the Gospel. This we are determined to do in the knowledge that they who put their trust in Him cannot be overcome.

Correspondence

"All Clear!"

Editor of UNITY:

Never have two words brought so much relief to the hearts and minds of eight million people as these. They are not called or spoken out by everybody but thought and felt alike by old and young, when the siren sends out its long unbroken sound all over London. And that has been happening several times at day and night now for three months.

I am living at a hotel in the center of London, one of the most vulnerable districts because of the many stations and public buildings by which it is surrounded. Our house will be closed in some days' time as it is the only one on this side of the road that is still inhabited, all the others have been bombed or damaged too much for being safely used as dwelling places. But on the opposite side of the street life is going on very vividly. A long row of houses, formerly a large hotel, has been filled up with hundreds of refugees from Gibraltar, mostly children between the ages of two and ten, women, and a few old men. It is cheering to hear the voices of so many merry Spanish children when they play in the street, sing and dance if a street organ or other musician happens to pass,—then you have the impression of being in one of the southern continental towns. But: suddenly the wailing sounds of the warning siren fall like a thunderbolt on the gay masses and in a few seconds the street is quiet like a churchyard, and a dumb depressing sentiment is darkening the whole atmosphere. Everybody is listening, looking up to the sky, and the nearby anti-aircraft guns are throwing out their warnings to the enemy planes that throw their bombs down on innocent beings and try to hit their targets. The children don't mind hearing the hissing and whistling and exploding of bombs that fall a distance away, but one night when the house next door was hit directly and all our windows smashed and the ceilings came down, I heard the children cry aloud from fright and shock. Still, soon they were asleep again, and playing quite cheerfully in the street next morning amongst the debris. And now, in the middle of the day, after a short time of deep silence outside, the relieving sounds are coming and hundreds of children's voices are gaily shouting: "all clear," "all clear!" Perhaps the only English words they know.

BETTY HIRSCH.

London, England

[Note: Miss Hirsch is a German woman, a Jewess, and a refugee in London. She has been blind from birth, and in Germany was the head of an important work for the relief and training of the blind. To appreciate this letter, we must imagine Miss Hirsch living through these air-raids and *seeing nothing*. It will be noted in her letter that she speaks of *hearing* the children in the streets! Miss Hirsch's home is in the Old City, bombed so terribly on December 29th. One wonders where she may be now.—J. H. H.]

Winston Churchill and America

Editor of UNITY:

In view of many statements appearing in the public columnists' contributions supporting the Presidential policy of "all out" and unneutral material and moral assistance to the beleaguered British Government, it may be of interest to your readers to learn that recent confirmation has reached me from two quarters of the authenticity of the profoundly penetrating observation of the Hon. Winston Churchill, now Prime Minister of Great Britain, to the effect that had America minded her own business and stayed out of the World War (i. e., the First World War), the then Allied Governments "would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917, thus saving over a million British, French, American, and other lives, and preventing the subsequent rise of Fascism and Naziism."

That statement, breath-taking in its implications, and as true today as it was in 1936, or 1917, reflects a very general opinion among Government and informed circles in England until the opening of the present criminal war, as the writer knows not only from his own personal contacts with journalists and others, in London, but also from the testimony of an American first secretary of legation, of many years' service in the Department of State, who heard Mr. Churchill's son-in-law, Mr. Dennis Sandys, express himself in exactly the same manner, in the summer of 1939. The statement quoted was made by Winston Churchill on August 11, 1936, to Mr. William Griffin, owner of the New York *Enquirer*, a publication which specializes in racing information, and which is still published on Sunday evenings. Mr. Churchill was interviewed by Mr. Griffin on his arrival in New York City by steamer from Europe. A reporter from the *Enquirer* was also present at the interview and took down Mr. Churchill's words verbatim. They were published in that journal on the following Sunday; and they also appeared in the *Congressional Record*.

They were re-published in the November, 1940, issue of "Scribner's Commentator" (p. 76), and in the November 15th issue of the "Anti-War News Service" of the Keep-America-Out-of-War Congress, with offices at 22 East 17th Street, New York City, and 532 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. They were quoted in a recent syndicated article by John T. Flynn, the well-known columnist, and doubtless will be—as they deserve to be—quoted again and again in the weeks to come, for they shed a revealing and historic light upon the direction of American foreign policy, now as in the past. Hindsight is better than foresight; and the colossal evil that great nations and governments perpetrate, while intending good, by abandoning lawful principle and resorting to the desperate gamble of war, declared or undeclared, is one of the most melancholy facts of politics and of history. . . .

Whosoever would make or keep peace in this sort of a world and this sort of a war, or revolution, verily, he must have clean hands and a neutral heart! And more knowledge and moral courage than most of us possess!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Washington, D. C.

UNITY Praised and Used

Editor of UNITY:

I have been a reader of UNITY for a long time, and I think you may remember the occasions when I have expressed my admiration for your writings.

I am endeavoring to edit a Jewish weekly in New Orleans, and rebuild its position in our community. It is not a task without difficulties.

I wonder if you would permit me to reprint occasionally your pertinent paragraphs called "Jottings." I would appreciate this so much, and I think it would lend a great attraction to the paper.

I cannot help but admire your strongly consistent and fine position during these most trying and difficult days. Let me send you good wishes for the heavy tasks of the year that lies ahead.

(RABBI) JULIAN B. FEIBELMAN.

New Orleans, Louisiana.

Where We Are Standing

Editor of UNITY:

I am very glad to know that you are standing where you are in this terrific world conflict, which will undoubtedly have a very sad ending. The chances that we will have for progress after that collapse will rest with men like you and the kind of courage and spirit which so very few people these days are willing to take upon themselves.

I am also glad that UNITY is forging ahead in spite of all other propaganda, and I know that as long as you remain the Editor it will continue to do so.

HANS H. BAASCH.

Sikeston, Missouri.

UNITY and War

Editor of UNITY:

* * * About UNITY! I have a list of friends I think would like your magazine. I'd be glad to send these names to you, if you will send them sample copies.

About the War! Do I sense a disposition on the part of the President to move a bit more cautiously? I hate war. Most certainly the aftermath of this one is to be a complete upheaval of everything.

We of the land of earthquakes salute you who build upon a rock.

MYLES D. BLANCHARD.

Sugar Hill, New Hampshire.